



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,490	03/08/2001	Christopher Keith	IVEN125530	4750

52531 7590 10/20/2006

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC  
1420 FIFTH AVENUE  
SUITE 2800  
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

FELTEN, DANIEL S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3693

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/801,490	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KEITH, CHRISTOPHER	
	<b>Examiner</b> Daniel S. Felten	<b>Art Unit</b> 3693	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Receipt of the Amendment filed July 10, 2006 amending claims 1, 13 and 14 is acknowledged. Claims 1-15 remain pending in the application and are presented to be examined by their merits.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. What is the term “premium” mean? Is it a fee added to the transaction or a price the buyer is willing to spend for a particular price of the order? What exactly do you mean to “automate” determining premiums. How is this done? What do you mean that the premiums are determined *relative to* a current market price? Shouldn’t there be one premium (price or fee), for instant current market price?

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3693

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain et al (US 6,343,278) in view of Lupien et al (US 5,689,652)

***Re claim 1***, a method of facilitating trading of orders in a batch process, comprising:

Automatically determining premiums offered or demanded for the orders in a batch at a particular price (see Jain, Abstract; col. 8, ll. 55+), and

Automatically pairing the orders in accordance with their respective premiums(see Jain, col. 1, ll. 39-46; and col. 2, ll. 4-13; and col. 9, ll. 20+).

***Re claim 3***, wherein determining the premiums occurs when the orders in the batch are posted to a batch process (see Jain, col. 9, ll. 21-37).

***Re claim 4***, Wherein automatically pairing includes giving preference to orders offering premiums, the preference being proportional to the size of the premium (see Jain, col. 9, ll 32-41).

***Re claim 5***, Wherein automatically pairing includes giving preference to orders demanding premiums, the preference being inversely proportional to the size of the premium (see Jain, col. col. 9, ll. 42-49).

Art Unit: 3693

**Re claim 6**, automatically setting the price for each pairing based on the premiums associated with the orders in the pairing (see Jain, col. 9, ll. 66 to col. 10, ll. 22).

**Re claim 7**, wherein each pairing includes a buy order and a sell order, and automatically setting sets the pairing price to a market price when both orders are offering a premium (see Jain, col. 8, ll. 55 to col. 9, ll. 19)

**Re claim 8**, wherein each pair includes a buy order and a sell order and the buy order offer premium is at least the sell order demand premium and automatically setting sets the pairing price to a market price plus the sell order premium (see Jain, col. 9, ll. 21+)

**Re claim 9**, wherein each pairing includes a buy order and a sell order and the sell order offer premium is at least the buy order demand premium, and automatically setting sets the pairing price a market price less the buy order premium (see Jain, col. 9, ll. 66 to col. 10, ll. 12).

**Re claim 10**, wherein each pairing includes a buy order and a sell order, and automatically setting marks the pairing as unmatchable when the premiums indicate lack of a mutually acceptable price

**Re claim 11**, wherein the premiums indicate lack of mutually acceptable price when the buy order demand premium is greater than the sell order offer premium (ii) the sell order is greater than the buy order offer premium ore (iii) the buy order and the sell order are both demanding premiums (see Jain, col. 10, ll. 47+)

**Re claim 12**, further comprising automatically adjusting the price for a pairing when one of the orders in the pairing is also participating in the unmatchable pairing (see Jain, col. 10, ll. 47+)

***Re claim 13***, automatically converting liquidity curves respectfully associated with the orders into premiums offered or demanded for orders and (see Jain, col. 8, ll. 55+)

***Re claims 1, 2, 13, 14 and 15:***

Jain fails to disclose wherein the premiums are determined relative to *a current market price* for the orders in the batch. Lupien discloses orders in a batch process in accordance with respective liquidity curves associated with the batch (see Lupien, see figs. Abstract, col. 3, ll. 43 to col. 4, ll. 40). Jain would have recognized the fact traders will pay a premium (default price or adjusted price) relative to the market price of a large quantity of stock (or group or batch of stock) in order to execute the trade (see Jain, column 15, lines 33-63). Lupien thus discloses a process that may be used in accordance with respective liquidity curves associated with the batch (see Lupien, see figs. Abstract, col. 3, ll. 43 to col. 4, ll. 40). It would have been obvious to employ into Jain the batch process of Lupien to allow traders to readily enter combinations of orders and trading strategies, as well as give users a degree of control and flexibility by providing greater market liquidity.

Jain fails to disclose wherein determining premiums occurs in accordance with respective *liquidity curves* associated with the orders in the batch. Lupien discloses trading orders in a batch process in accordance with respective liquidity curves associated with the batch (see Lupien, see figs. Abstract, col. 3, ll. 43 to col. 4, ll. 40). It is well known that a large quantity of stock that is disproportional to the stock's average trading volume, the buyers or seller will pay a premium to the market price of the stock in order to execute the trade. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Jain would have recognized the notoriously old and well known batch order

Art Unit: 3693

process and have been motivated to integrate liquidity curves in association with a batch (or *group*) of orders to allow traders to readily enter combinations of orders and trading strategies, as well as give users a degree of control and flexibility by providing greater market liquidity. Thus such a feature would provide greater user satisfaction and thus constitute an obvious expedient well within the ordinary skill in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S. Felten whose telephone number is (571) 272-6742. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

Art Unit: 3693


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's email is [Daniel.Felten@uspto.gov](mailto:Daniel.Felten@uspto.gov). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



DSF  
10/13/2006

Daniel S Felten  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3693

  
ELLA COLBERT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER